

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

QUINN GOLDMAN,

Petitioner,

V.

DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID,

Respondent.

Case No. 6:21-cv-164-JDK-JDL

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Petitioner Quinn Goldman, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate proceeding pro se, filed this federal petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The petition was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

Petitioner was permitted to supplement the record on four separate occasions after filing his petition. Docket Nos. 12, 18, 21, 25. On September 2, 2021, Respondent filed an answer to which Petitioner replied. Docket Nos. 16, 19.

On January 26, 2023, Judge Love issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the Court deny the petition on its merits and dismiss this case with prejudice. Judge Love also recommended that a certificate of appealability be denied. Docket No. 26. A copy of this Report was mailed to Petitioner, who has not filed written objections, but has moved to supplement the record for a fifth time. Docket No. 27.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).


Here, Petitioner did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge’s findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge’s Report are filed, the standard of review is “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law”).

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Even if the Court were to consider the material included with Petitioner’s belated motion to supplement, nothing in those records changes the correctness of the Magistrate Judge’s conclusion that Petitioner’s total effective sentence has been calculated correctly pursuant to the applicable state law. *See* Docket No. 27.

Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 26) as the findings of this Court.

This petition for habeas corpus is hereby **DENIED** and this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice. The Court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **23rd** day of **March, 2023**.



JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE